

Appl. No. 09/712,578

R E M A R K S

Claims 3-9, 11 and 12 stand as previously presented. Claims 2, 10, 13-17 and 19-21 have been amended. Claims 1 and 18 have been cancelled.

5 Claims 1-21 were considered in the Office Action.

10 Claims 1, 13 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishida et al., U.S. Patent 5,359,385. Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishida in view of Watanabe et al.,  
15 U.S. Patent 6,665,015. Claims 15-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishida in view of Ueno et al., U.S. Patent 5,479,206. Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishida in view of Ueno and in further view of Squall et al., U.S. Patent 6,623,528. Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueno in view of Ishida. Claims 2-12 and 19-20 stand objected-to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and  
20 any intervening claims.

25 Objected-to claims 2, 10, 19 and 20 have been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and are therefore believed allowable for at least the reasons set forth by the Examiner in the Office Action mailed August 27, 2004. Objected-to claims 3-9 depend ultimately upon claim 2 which is allowable as indicated above, and are themselves allowable for at least that reason. Objected-to claims 11 and 12 depend upon claim 10 which is allowable as indicated above, and are  
30 themselves allowable for at least that reason. Claims 13-17 have been amended to depend from claim 2 rather than cancelled claim 1, and are therefore allowable at least because they

Appl. No. 09/712,578

depend from claim 2 which is allowable as indicated above. Claim 21 has been amended to expressly recite that user preferences in a plurality of settings are tracked by storing previous settings states as at least one cluster of points in a settings space. As indicated by the Examiner in paragraphs 15 and 17 of the Office Action mailed August 27, 2004, the cited references do not disclose or suggest storing settings in a settings space in an imaging device. Applicants believe that currently pending claim 21 is allowable for at least this reason.

The Applicants believe that the currently pending claims are allowable over the cited references and respectfully request the timely issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Dated: 10/25/04

Respectfully submitted,  
KLAAS, LAW, O'MEARA & MALKIN, P.C.

By:

Guy R. Clinger  
Guy R. Clinger Esq.  
Registration No. 42,422  
1999 Broadway, Suite 2225  
Denver, CO 80202  
(303) 298-9888  
Fax: (303) 297-2266